

RESPIRATORY CARE  
Guidelines for Reviewers  
**ORIGINAL RESEARCH** submissions

The author's main job in writing a manuscript reporting an original research study is to answer the following questions, as clearly and concisely as possible:

- Why did you start? (Introduction)
- What did you do? (Methods)
- What answer did you get? (Results)
- What does it mean? (Discussion)

Each section of the paper needs to be long enough and comprehensive enough to answer its main question, and should not contain elements of other sections or other unnecessary material. Here are some additional points that may facilitate review of the manuscript:

**TITLE:**

This should indicate the specific content of the article and be informative when seen by itself in a table of contents or bibliography. It should include the main key words used in indexing.

Does the paper's title reflect the paper's content?

**ABSTRACT:**

This should be an informative miniature of the article, briefly presenting the main points, including the answers to the four questions stated above. It should be structured according to the Journal's style.

Is the abstract informative: briefly outlining hypotheses, methods, results, and conclusions?

**INTRODUCTION:**

This should tell what was studied and why. The research question(s) the study sought to answer, or the hypothesis tested, should be stated specifically and clearly.

1. Is the background information adequate to introduce the research problem?
2. Are the references adequate?
3. Are specific study objectives or hypotheses stated?
4. Is the writing in this section clear and concise?

**METHODS:**

This section tells how the research was carried out. It should provide enough detail so that a reader can (1) judge the validity of the study, and (2) replicate the study if desired. The Methods section also identifies any statistical tests and criteria for significance employed in the study.

1. Are there outcome variables described for each study objective or hypothesis?

2. Are there appropriate descriptions of how calculated values were determined?
3. Are outcome variables that do not relate to the objectives or hypotheses avoided?
4. Are the measurement procedures appropriate for the study objectives or hypotheses?
5. Is there enough detail to judge validity and for readers to replicate study?
6. Were appropriate statistical methods chosen for this study design?
7. Are the tables and illustrations adequate?
8. Is the writing in this section clear and concise?
9. Are there any results given in this section? (There should not be.)

#### RESULTS:

This section presents the study's findings, including the statistical analysis. This section contains the evidence by which the author attempts to convince the reader, but should not contain discussion or other elements belonging in other sections.

1. Are there complete data for each procedure or test described in the Methods section?
2. Do the data, or descriptions of the data, appear to be valid?
3. Are data that do not relate to the study objectives or hypotheses avoided?
4. Are the tables and illustrations adequate?
5. Does the text avoid presenting the same data as the tables or illustrations?
6. Is the writing in this section clear and concise?

#### DISCUSSION:

In this section the author explains what he or she thinks the results of the study mean. This may require presentation of supportive evidence from previously published literature, as well as contradictory findings by other investigators and any limitations of the study. At the end of the Discussion the author should clearly state the intended conclusions to be drawn from the study.

1. Is there an explanation of how the results address the problem statement or hypotheses?
2. Are theoretical and practical aspects of the results discussed?
3. Do you agree with the interpretation of the results?
4. Is there a comparison of this study with previously published studies?
5. Are the references adequate?
6. Is there a discussion of the limitations of the study?
7. Is there a section that clearly states the author's conclusions?
8. Is the writing in this section clear and concise?
9. Are additional results presented in this section? (There should not be.)

#### REFERENCES:

These should be appropriate for the study question, methods used, results, and discussion in both number and content, and they should be up to date. All references cited should be pertinent to the present study, and the inclusion of unnecessary references or citations to articles not directly related to the issues being discussed should be avoided.

#### QUICK LOOK:

The Quick Look provides readers with the concise take-home message of the study. Authors should provide approximately 4-8 declarative sentences, including *Current knowledge* and *What this paper contributes to our knowledge*.

1. Does the *Current knowledge* section summarize current understanding of the topic at hand (ie, define the state of the art)?
2. Does the *What this paper contributes to our knowledge* section only provide information supported by the study's data?
3. Does the Quick Look overstate the study results or suggest further research is needed? (It should not.)

#### TABLES AND FIGURES:

These should be used to clarify and better depict the study's results, and should not simply duplicate data presented in the text. Tables should be clear, self-explanatory, and uncomplicated, as should figures, including their accompanying legends.

#### GENERAL

1. Do you think statistical consultation would be helpful?
2. If the Editor recommends revision, would you be willing to review the revised manuscript?
3. Do you feel that an editorial would be appropriate to accompany the manuscript, if published?
4. Be as specific as possible in your comments; the goal is to help the authors improve the manuscript.